

Restoration Alabama Hills Protection (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700357

A. List of Restoration Activities

"The protection of restored areas through the placement of physical barriers, patrols and vertical mulching". (4970.11 (e) (5))

Currently, previously restored areas have been violated and are in need of additional barricading, vertical mulching, and patrols.

This will be accomplished through patrols and maintenance of site specific restoration projects by a full time Park Ranger whose duty area will be the Alabama Hills. The Project period is three years.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

This Project is intended to protect and maintain previous restoration efforts in areas damaged by OHV use.

The Alabama Hills provides OHV recreation in a unique geological and historical backdrop.

Previous Project activities included realigning and restricting parking areas; closing motorized challenge areas; restoring habitat damaged by irresponsible and illegal OHV use; developing and printing of maps, rules and regulations and monitoring. These actions have been implemented and have improved resource values. The Project seeks to continue and maintain these activities.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

Total affected land that underwent restoration treatments is equal to about 5 acres of land and about 3 mile of roads. The Project areas are contained within the 30,000 acre Alabama Hills Special Recreation Management Area.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Closed routes or areas:

Monitor site specific visitor compliance 4 four days a week through visual assessment.

Annual photo landscape monitoring for level of change in view sheds.

Vegetation:

Monitor seedling survival rate six months initially and then annually.

Monitor for invasive exotics species.

Soils:

Monitor erosion control devices for effectiveness during weekly visual assessments after precipitation.

Success Criteria:

90% visitor compliance rate on closed routes.

90% reduction of vehicular impacts area wide.

15 % to 25% increase in plant cover from within a 6 year post-project implementation.

50% seedling survival rate.

Soils not moving off-site.

E. List of Reports

Full before and after photos.

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

The Project is exclusively designed for the protection of restored areas. Personnel, whose duty area will be the Project area, will patrol at a minimum of four days per week. The patrol season will be during peak recreational use periods of October through March. Signs and barricades are in place and will be maintained or improved. Visitor services provided for the area include education materials and OHV maps showing preferred designated routes.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700357

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Alabama Hills Project Location](#)

[Alabama Hills Site Map 1](#)

[Alabama Hills Site Map 2](#)

[Alabama Hills Site Map 3](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Photo Point 8](#)

[Photo Point 10](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Alabama Hills Protection (FINAL)

3/1/2010

Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Bishop Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration Alabama Hills Protection (FINAL)	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	G09-01-05-R02
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>"The protection of restored areas through the placement of physical barriers, patrols and vertical mulching". (4970.11 (e) (5))</p> <p>Currently, previously restored areas have been violated and are in need of additional barricading, vertical mulching, and patrols.</p> <p>This will be accomplished through patrols and maintenance of site specific restoration projects by a full time Park Ranger whose duty area will be the Alabama Hills. The Project period is three years.</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Park Ranger	3120.000	17.000	HRS	26,000.00	27,040.00	53,040.00
2	Contracts						
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Signs Notes : Estimate repair or replacement of signs.	1.000	250.000	MISC	0.00	250.00	250.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Alabama Hills Protection (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Indirect Costs-Administrative overhead	1.000	500.000	EA	0.00	500.00	500.00
Total Program Expenses					26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: Restoration Alabama Hills Protection (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	26,000.00	27,040.00	53,040.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	250.00	250.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	500.00	500.00	
Total Program Expenses		26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		26,000.00	27,790.00	53,790.00	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700357

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

No negative impact to wetlands, navigable waters, and sensitive habitats and species would occur. (Including threatened and endangered species). Projects would be designed to ensure no additional opportunity for sediment (the major water quality pollutant) transport in to streams, springs and shallow pond locations. Additionally, sensitive habitats and species would benefit from the Project by restoring habitat and removing habitat fragmentation. Water quality and habitat is furthered discussed in Environmental Assessment CA-170-06-26

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

No cumulative impacts would occur. The Project is to maintain existing restoration projects through maintenance and monitoring.

The existing projects have cumulatively improved cultural resources, vegetative and wildlife habitat, visual resources, etc. Additionally, annual maintenance has kept motorized access opportunities available and protected adjacent resources for public appreciation and use.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

The possibilities that this project would have such an effect are none. The project seeks to lessen impacts by maintaining the closure of hill climbs or routes to vehicles where erodible soil and loss of vegetation exist. During maintenance and monitoring personnel would avoid steep slopes, erodible soils, sensitive areas and re-vegetation/seeded areas. Project vehicles are restricted to existing roads, trails and parking areas.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

All projects would be implemented to conform to prescribed visual resource management (VRM) classes. Restoration sites currently have a high visual contrast with the surrounding vegetation in the view shed. This draws the observer's attention to the surface disturbance, thus compromising VRM class objectives. The project seeks to maintain the improved visual resources by bringing back natural vegetation patterns through maintenance and monitoring.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

A class III intensive cultural survey concluded that 'No cultural properties will be negatively affected by this project'. The report is on file in the BLM Bishop Field Office.

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The possibility that uses may go elsewhere is present. The purpose of this Project to help prevent off-site impacts. Park Rangers will patrol the surrounding areas looking for new routes. We currently have a complete GPS inventory and aerial photos taken in 2005. Patrol personnel have this data available to them for use in the field.

Past Projects, such as this, have not increased the use in the vicinity of the Project site nor is it expected to because it is not a development or additional recreation attraction.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[OHV Route Restoration EA](#)

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700357

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 5

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☒ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☐ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 9

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [2]
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

Restored habitat includes unauthorized OHV routes that crossed stream courses/riparian area, were on steep slopes subject to soil erosion, presented a visual scar and were damaging the unique geological features of the Alabama Hills.

The Bishop RMP states of the area; Yearlong protection of the Alabama Hills. Target resources are scenic values, geological features and riparian habitats.

Enter number of sensitive habitats; 1) Riparian habitat and 2) unique geological features.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)
☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

The Southern Owens Valley Management Area provides important wildlife habitat due to unique physiographic features such as the Alabama Hills where topography and vegetation provide important cover and food values for resident mule deer. Unauthorized road proliferation throughout the Alabama Hills compromises the integrity of this habitat by removing vegetation cover and increasing soil erosion. The Bishop Resource Management Plan (1993) stipulates yearlong protection of mule deer migration corridors in the Southern Owens Valley Management Area and specifies reaching Desired Plant Community (DPC) goals of sagebrush-bitterbrush habitat to provide cover and forage for mule deer and tule elk.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

The previous Project focused on closing and restoring, to a natural state, newly created routes, designating and defining parking areas, closing hill-climb routes on steep slopes where erosion was increasing. Tasks included soil de-compaction of the routes, installing barricades, planting of native vegetation, soil erosion control measures, interpretative signs and producing a user guide. The focus will be on uninterrupted access to recreational areas on designated and more terrain-sensitive routes. The current Project will maintain these activities.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

BLM Bishop Field Office's Resource Management Plan (RMP 1993) which limits motorized vehicle use to designated roads and trails. These unauthorized routes did not exist on BLM's current travel management route inventory as authorized routes, and subsequently are subject to closure and restoration.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

Present and future operational costs will be funded under congressionally appropriated annual or deferred maintenance programs. (Subactivities 1651 and 1652)

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The Alabama Hills Stewardship Group (basically a citizen group) has public meetings bi-monthly in Lone Pine and discusses broader issues concerning the Alabama Hills with the public. A sub-committee was formed with interested stakeholders to explore ideas that arise from the stewardship group and recommendations for implementation. The Project has unanimous support from the group. The Stewardship won the Dept of the Interior Cooperative Conservation award in 2008

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

The Alabama Hills Stewardship Group, the Lone Pine Chamber of Commerce, the Beverly and Jim Rogers Museum of Lone Pine Film History, and the Gear Grinders 4 WD Club.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

With the formation of the Stewardship Group, volunteer and paid patrols along with educational outreach a majority of irresponsible OHV use has effectively been addressed and resolved.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- ☒ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)